

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS


The above amendment should be entered as it raises no new issues – previously considered dependent Claims 30 and 44 have been incorporated into independent Claims 29 and 43.¹ This amendment thus emphasizes a previously claimed preferred aspect of the invention where carbon dioxide is in the supercritical state. This aspect of the invention is missing from all applied references.

While Applicant disagrees with the Office's characterization of crosslinking set forth at page 6 of the Communication dated October 19, 2006, this issue is moot in view of Applicant's claimed limitation wherein carbon dioxide is in the supercritical state. Nothing in any applied references – Jones, Akimoto, Okamoto or Barbieri – disclose or suggest the use of carbon dioxide in the supercritical state, nor do any of the applied references enable such use.

Accordingly, and in view of the remarks herein Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the passage of this case to Issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 412-6007 (direct)
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

¹ Should the Examiner somehow consider the present amendment to raise new issues he is asked to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number provided. Applicant is entitled to the Examiner's opinion concerning already examined Claims 30 and 44. A review of the comments in the outstanding Official Action shows that these claims were not specifically addressed.